

Applicant : Ilya Schiller et al.  
Serial No. : 09/832,340  
Filed : April 10, 2001  
Page : 5 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 19965-004001

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-15 and replace all the original sheets including Figs. 1-15.

In each figure, higher-quality illustrations and text have been substituted for the original. Figs. 12 and 13 are now on a single sheet. No substantive changes have been made.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (9 pages)

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

**Drawings**

**2. Figures 1,5,12-13 and 14-15 are objected to because of poor quality (see handwritten portions also). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.**

Corrected drawings are attached.

**4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamakita, Tooru EP 0865 192.**

**Regarding claim 1, Yamakita teaches a method comprising:**

**Receiving handwriting data (writing data on portable terminal) electronically from a remote user at a handwritten-information server (host device) (page 1, column 1), and**

**Processing the handwriting data in accordance with instructions provided to the server by the user (page 1, column 2).**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite receiving “data in vector format representing handwriting motion.” In some examples described in the specification, a vector is described as sets of coordinate values in a two-coordinate system.

In Yamakita, the handwriting data is consistently described as comprising an image of writings on paper as captured by a camera. (e.g., col. 5, ll. 29-31, “The portable terminal 1 has an image input unit 1a including an electronic camera [and] has a function of sending image data taken in by using the image input unit 1a to another device.”; col. 7, ll. 50-56, “When it is desired to convert characters or figures written on paper or the like ...[the user] image[s] it with a camera or the like, and transmit[s] the image data.”) Even Yamakita’s narrow reference to a handwriting pen makes clear that the “locus pattern pressed on the LCD display unit 11 by the pen input is [stored] as data of a bitmapped form.” (col. 11, ll. 37-41) Yamakita does not describe and would not have made obvious receiving data representing handwriting motion in vector format.

**For claim 2,**

\*\*\*

**Regarding claim 4**

\*\*\*

**For claim 5,**

\*\*\*

**For claim 7,**

\*\*\*

**Referring to claim 8,**

\*\*\*

**Also to claim 9,**

\*\*\*

**Regarding claim 10,**

\*\*\*

**6. Claims 3,6 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakita, Tooru EP 0865 192 as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lee U.S. Patent No. 5,347,477.**

**Regarding claim 3,**

\*\*\*

**For claim 6,**

\*\*\*

All of the defendant claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

**For claim 12, please refer back to claims 3 and 6 for the teaching of wireless communication. In addition, Yamakita teaches the concept of storing (computer) (page 2, column 1, line 30).**

Claim 12 has been amended and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

**Referring to claim 13, please refer back to claims 3, 6 and 12 for the teaching of wireless communication. Furthermore, Yamakita teaches a method providing an interactive user interface on a screen of a mobile device to enable a user to control functions (commands) applied (page 7, column 11, lines 3 9-47) to the handwriting information (simple interface) (page 2, column 2, lines 40-45).**

Claim 13 has been amended for clarity. In Yamakita, any control applied to the handwriting information is done before the information is sent to the server. (col. 12, ll. 2-6 et seq.) Yamakita does not describe and would not have made obvious “enable[ing] the user [of a mobile device] to control functions applied to the stored handwriting information” that has been stored on the server.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant : Ilya Schiller et al.  
Serial No. : 09/832,340  
Filed : April 10, 2001  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 19965-004001

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a \$1020 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, Order No. 19965-004001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/18/01



David L. Feigenbaum  
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906